

Application No. 10/692,247
Response Dated 04/26/2007
Reply to Office Action of 02/01/2007
Page 5 of 7

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 26 2007

REMARKS:

These remarks are in response to the non-final Office Action mailed 02/01/07 in which claims 18-26 are pending. Claims 1-17 have been withdrawn as being directed to non-elected species. Claims 18-26 stand rejected.

In the present application claim 18 is independent. Claim 18 has been amended to further define the subject matter of the shaving aid strip of present invention as comprising a water-sensitive soluble polymer comprising polyethylene oxide. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph [0022] of the specification. Claim 19 has been canceled without prejudice. Claim 18 has been further amended to include the recitation of claim 25 that "the chelating agent comprises from about 0.1 to 10 weight percent of the total weight of the shaving aid strip." Support for this amendment can be found at least in the scope of now-canceled claim 25. Claim 25 has been canceled.

No new matter was added in making the aforementioned amendments.

The Examiner rejected claims 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Creasy et al. (4,875,287), hereinafter Creasy.

The disclosure of Creasy is directed to:

a shaving article such as a shaving cartridge which includes at least one blade and a blade support having a skin-engaging portion adjacent to a shaving edge of the blade. The skin-engaging portion is provided with a hydrogel comprising a water soluble polymer bound so as to prevent dissolution whereby the coefficient of friction of the skin-engaging portion is reduced in the presence of water.

Claim 18 has been amended as previously described. For a rejection to be made under 35 U.S.C 102, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. The Applicants contend that Creasy fails to anticipate, teach or suggest at least the limitation "the chelating agent comprises from about 0.1 to 10 weight percent of the total weight of the shaving aid strip" as recited in claim 18. As such, Creasy ~~does not~~ anticipate claim 18 and it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 is allowable over Creasy. Because claims 20-24 and 26 depend from claim 18, claims 20-24 and 26 add recitations that further define the subject matter of independent claim 18. As claim 18 is believed to be allowable, claims 20-24 and 26 are therefore also believed to be allowable. The Applicants therefore respectfully requested

Application No. 10/692,247
Response Dated 04/26/2007
Reply to Office Action of 02/01/2007
Page 6 of 7

the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 18, 20-24 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Creasy. The rejection of claims 19 and 25 is moot as these claims have been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Creasy.

In the present response claim 25 has been canceled. However its recitation has been incorporated into claim 18. Consequently this rejection will be addressed as it applies to amended claim 18 and its dependent claim 26.

Claim 18 has been amended as previously described. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The Applicants contend that Creasy teaches away from "a water-sensitive soluble polymer" and especially a soluble polymer "comprising polyethylene oxide" recited in amended claim 1 of the present application. Creasy states (in the paragraph bridging columns 1 and 2, from Col 1, line 66 to Col 2, line 14):

Similar to the Booth disclosure (US 4,170,821 which discloses water-soluble polyethylene oxide (Col 1, line 47 of Creasy), deposited on the skin in use through dissolution in water (Col 1, lines 54-55 of Creasy)), the surface-affecting agent or component of Pentney and Calvert (GB 2,024,082) is deposited in use by dissolution in water. This feature present in both the above disclosures can result in several drawbacks relating to useful shaving unit life, unnecessary shelf-life problems and restrictions on use caused by sensitivity to moisture, possible agent-induced problems including concentration and rate of release, etc. These problems are exacerbated by the use of the lubricant in the presence of an abrasive such as whiskers on the skin which can cause excessive and accelerated deterioration. The lubricant can leave the shaver with a sticky feeling and can lead to itching and irritation. Additionally, lubricant deposited on the skin can reduce the important tensioning and conditioning effect of a guard thereby leading to lower quality shaves.

Application No. 10/692,247
Response Dated 04/26/2007
Reply to Office Action of 02/01/2007
Page 7 of 7

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 26 2007

The Applicants therefore contend that Creasy fails to teach or suggest at least the limitation "a water-sensitive soluble polymer comprising polyethylene oxide" as recited in claim 18. The Applicants therefore contend that claim 18 is allowable over Creasy. Because claim 26 depends from claim 18, claim 26 adds recitations that further define the subject matter of independent claim 18. As claim 18 is believed to be allowable, claim 26 is therefore also believed to be allowable. The Applicants therefore respectfully requested the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Creasy.

SUMMARY:

In summary, the Applicants believe that the foregoing remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action and that the amended claims herein are allowable. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection and objection be withdrawn and the present application be passed onto allowance.

The Applicants believe that no additional fees are due with the filing of the present response, however, if any additional fees are due, authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No 50-4112.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
David C. Coffin
Registration No. 57,908

Michaud-Duffy Group LLP
CenterPoint
306 Industrial Park Road, Suite 206
Middletown, CT 06457-1532
Tel: (860) 632-7200
Fax: (860) 632-8269